Constructional schemas in variation : modelling contrastive negation

Silvennoinen, Olli O.

2018

Silvennoinen , O O 2018 , ' Constructional schemas in variation : modelling contrastive negation ' , Constructions and Frames , vol. 10 , no. 1 , pp. 1-37 . https://doi.org/10.1075/cf.00009.sil

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/307400
https://doi.org/10.1075/cf.00009.sil

unspecified
acceptedVersion

(4) [X not Y]
Shaken, not stirred.

(5) [X and not Y]
Shaken and not stirred.

(6) Expanded [X not Y]
The drink is shaken. It is not stirred.

What separates contrastive negation from previously studied grammatical alternations is the large number of constructions that are formally analogous to one another. Schemas (1)–(3) place the negated element first, schemas (4)–(6) place it second. Schemas (2) and (4) are asyndetic, i.e., they have no overt coordinator, while also being sub-clausal, whereas (1) and (5) are syndetic and generally sub-clausal.[2] (3) and (6) are also asyndetic but clausal; for them, I have retained McCawley's (1991) term "expanded".

On the other hand, these six constructional schemas cross-cut three semantic types, as defined on the basis of overtly coded scalarity (Dik et al. 1981:59-68).[3] The basic type is replacive, which has no overtly coded markers of scalarity in either conjunct. The second type is additive, in which there is a scalar expression (e.g., just, only, simply, merely) attached to the negated conjunct, and the third is restrictive, in which a scalarity marker attaches to the affirmed conjunct. Examples (7)–(8) illustrate the [not X but Y] schema with replacive, additive and restrictive semantics, respectively:

(7) Savoy is not an archaeologist but an explorer. [AAT, 189][4]

(8) 'There is a moral crisis in sport not only in Canada but on a worldwide scale,' he said. [A2S, 281]

---

[2] The [not X but Y] schema is only prototypically sub-clausal, while [X and not Y] always operates on the constituent level.
[3] The three semantic types are based on the three types of co
focus phenomena, though they call them "replacing", "restricting" and "expanding". Dik et al. also treat example (i) as "selective focus" which is a non-corrective type of focus, "because A's presupposition [...] is (Dik et al. 1981:62). This distinction will not have consequences for the analysis presented here, and therefore the issue is left aside in the present paper.
(i) A: Did John buy coffee or rice?
B: John bought coffee, not rice. (Dik et al. 1981:62, modified)
[4] The three-character code in square brackets refers to a file in the BNC and the number to the s-unit (i.e., orthographic sentence or turn) in that file. Examples without a code or a source reference are constructed by the author.

(9) It is particularly illogical that this kind of argument should be coming from politicians who, in other contexts, would be the first to argue, and rightly, that Vietnam is not some kind of monster State, but merely a ramshackle and inefficient one that has lost its way. [BNC, A1J 13]

All six constructional schemas can be used for all three semantic types, and in fact all combinations are attested. This alone is equal to H L J K W H H Q S R W H Q W L D O F R Q V W U X F W L R Q V constructicon, i.e., list of constructions. This makes the quantitative treatment of contrastive negation challenging, and from a psycholinguistic point of view it is also obvious that not all of those constructions are H Q W U H Q F K H G L Q D V S H D N H U Z U L W H U ¶ V F R Q V W[5]

The literature contains very little information on contrastive negation from the point of view of constructional variation in any language. The existing descriptions of the phenomenon are mainly based on anecdotal, introspective or experimental data, and they offer few clues as to why a specific construction might be chosen in a given context. The studies that do consider usage data have only done so regarding individual constructions (e.g., Toosarvandani 2016). For this reason, this study takes an exploratory approach to the constructional variation of contrastive negation. Using data from the British National Corpus (BNC), I model the behaviour of the six constructional schemas with multiple correspondence analysis (MCA). The research questions that I ask are the following:

- What usage patterns are associated with which constructional schemas?
- How close are the schemas to one another in terms of their usage patterns?
- Are there true synonyms among the schemas?

My working assumption is that the schemas exemplified in (1) through (6) are surface generalisations (Goldberg 2006:23), i.e., abstractions over more specific constructions. However, Z K H W K H U W K H V H J H Q H U D O L V D W L R Q V D U H V X S H U I L F L D O R U H P S L U L F D O O \ U H S U H , D G R S W 7 U D X J R W W D Q G 7 U R X V G D O H ¶ V F R Q F H S W L R which constructions range from highly abstract constructional schemas (constructions) to

[5] This, of course, does not mean that speakers without a given construction would not be able to recognise it when faced with a relevant construct in discourse. Fillmore et al. (1988:502) make a distinction between knowing the meaning of a construction and figuring it out. For instance, an expanded negative second construction of the additive type would readily be understood as such even if the hearer did not possess this particular construction as an entrenched item in their constructicon.

mid-level sub-schemas (meso-constructions) and lexically specific fixed expressions (micro-constructions). I consider the construction types (e.g., the [X not Y] schema) to be constructional schemas, and the specific combinations of a construction type with a semantic type (e.g., the additive [X not only Y] schema, as in shaken, not only stirred) to be potential sub-schemas.[6] Speakers also have the possibility of recording micro-constructions in the domain of contrastive negation (e.g., shaken, not stirred LV SURED EO\ OLVWHG LQ PRVW (QJOLVK VSHDNHUV) In general, lower-level constructions are more psychologically real to speakers as using a lower-level construction does not necessarily mean that the higher-level schema is evoked (see Hilpert 2015; Perek 2015). Low-level schemas also have richer semantics than the constructional schema, being less abstracted from individual constructs used in discourse. The present study will explore which VFKHPDV W\SLFDOO\ KDYH WKH VWDWXV RI FRQVWUXFWLRQV GR QRW 7KHUHIRUH , VKDOO PRVWO\ XVH WKH WHUP ³VFK deem there to be sufficient reasons for positing a conventionalised unit.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In section 2, I present the data and methods. Section 3 then discusses the variables used in the analysis. Section 4 presents the results and section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Data and methods

Given the diversity in the expression of contrastive negation, corpus data is needed to examine the variation between the schemas. My study will use the British National Corpus (BNC) as data. The BNC is a multi-genre corpus of roughly 100 million words of British English collected mostly in the early 1990s. Around 10% of it is spoken, the rest written. Specifically, I shall be using the national broadsheet component of the corpus. The broadsheet data amounts to approximately 3

[6] This should not be taken as denial of the fact that speakers often store redundant patterns (Langacker 1987:29). Given that these storage patterns are a matter of individuals, they fall beyond the scope of this paper, which is based on population-level corpus data.